

LINCOLN PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 24, 2007

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Planning Board was held on Wednesday, January 24, 2007, at the Town Hall, 100 Old River Road, Lincoln, RI.

Chairman Mancini called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. The following members were present: Kenneth Bostic, John Hunt, John Mancini, Gregory Mercurio, Gerald Olean and Michael Reilly. Absent was Patrick Crowley. Also in attendance were Town Planner Albert Ranaldi, Town Engineer Kim Wiegand and Town Solicitor Mark Krieger. Margaret Weigner kept the minutes.

Chairman Mancini introduced new Planning Board member Kenneth Bostic and former member John Hunt who moved out of his district and was reappointed in his new district. Mr. Olean wanted it noted that the new members were duly sworn in by the proper authority prior to the start of the meeting.

Chairman Mancini advised six members present; have quorum.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

Mr. Olean made a motion to dispense with the reading of the May 24,

2006 Planning Board minutes. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Olean made a motion to accept the minutes of May 24, 2006 as amended. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Olean made a motion to dispense with the reading of the June 28, 2006 Planning Board minutes. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Olean made a motion to accept the minutes of June 28, 2006 as amended. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Mancini stated that any item on the consent agenda could be removed and discussed separately by making a motion. There are seven items under Zoning Applications and five items under Correspondence/Miscellaneous on the agenda for consideration.

Mr. Olean made a motion to remove the item for JCM, LLC from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Mercurio asked about the item for Superb Builders. If the TRC recommends denial of the application for a variance, and something has already been constructed, what happens at that point? Mr. Krieger stated under general conditions, an order could be issued to have the structure removed. If the Zoning Board does not grant the variance, the Zoning Official could issue an order for the removal of the structure, which is sure to be appealed. Chairman Mancini asked what other options were available. Mr. Krieger stated that the structure is larger than 500 sq. ft. and must conform to the zoning setbacks as an accessory structure. Removal of the structure or downsizing of the structure is a couple of options. Mr. Reilly asked if the building inspector could refuse to issue a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and Mr. Krieger stated that he would have to confer with the building inspector. Mr. Mercurio was concerned with a similar situation and asked how it was allowable if a major piece of the property is nonconforming to issue a CO when it was part of the structure and a building permit was granted. Chairman Mancini stated that it is out of the Planning Board's hands. Mr. Krieger stated that a Municipal Court is up and running to address zoning and building violations. Based on that, Mr. Mercurio wanted to keep Superb Builders under the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Olean made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Mr. Mercurio seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Olean made a motion to move item #7 up on the agenda. Mr. Mercurio seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

MINOR SUBDIVISION REVIEW

a. Roberts Minor Subdivision AP 23 Lot 68 Preliminary Plan Review/

Roberts Family Trust Great Road & Sherman Ave Approval

Mr. Ranaldi stated that this is a subdivision of one lot into three single-family residential lots. The Preliminary Plan submittal received a Certificate of Completeness on January 16, 2007, and the Board has until March 21, 2007 to approve, approve with conditions, or deny. The TRC has reviewed the application. The proposed lots have the required 20,000 sq. ft. of buildable area. A Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) was received for Great Road. Each house is designed with grading and drainage specifically for the constraints of the lots. In addition to the regular conditions of approval, the final plans would have to show the house foot print be as they are shown on the plans right now. The houses would not be able to be changed since they were designed within this specific topography. The TRC recommends approval with conditions. A sedimentation and erosion control plan is required for each house at building permit level. A pre-blast survey is required if blasting is necessary. A permit is required from Narragansett Bay Commission (NBC). Final approval is

needed from the Lincoln Water Commission. A note must be added on the final plans that no finished floors or basements shall be constructed at or below the seasonal high groundwater. A note is required on the final plans that zoning setbacks shown are for reference only, actual setbacks to be determined at time of construction. The applicant must apply for the availability of public sanitary sewers - sewers are available in the area. The new houses must have dry wells installed to capture the roof runoff. Granite bounds must be installed at the new proposed property corners. Chairman Mancini asked if a bond was needed, and Mr. Ranaldi stated that there are no public improvements.

Brian Thalmann, of Thalmann Engineering, representing Mr. Roberts, stated that he is present to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Mr. Olean asked if there were plans that showed the abutters, as the current plans do not show much of the abutting property. Sherman Avenue is a narrow street and the road curves dramatically to the right. He would like to see more of the topography of the land. He lives on this street. He would like to see the sight distance. Coming out of the driveway, there does not seem to be much sight distance on Sherman Avenue. This is an unusual situation; look at the topography of the land. Mr. Thalmann could ask the surveyor to show more area. Mr. Olean asked what the road width was. Mr. Thalmann replied 20' wide. Mr. Olean asked what the right of way

was. Mr. Thalmann replied 33'. Mr. Olean asked if the rocks were in the right of way or on private property. Mr. Thalmann replied a combination of both. Mr. Olean asked what the buildable lot area was of the Sherman Avenue lot. Mr. Thalmann replied 22,516 sq. ft. Mr. Ranaldi agreed. Mr. Olean asked if the applicant had any problems with conditions set forth by the TRC and Mr. Thalmann replied no. Mr. Olean asked about the drainage on the backside of the property - where does it drain? Mr. Thalmann replied to the wetlands. There will be no increase to the wetlands. The drainage has been worked so that there is no increase in runoff. As part of the RIDEM permitting process, it must be established that there is no increase in runoff and no undue impacts to the wetlands complexes. Mr. Olean asked Mr. Thalmann to explain the letter of non-jurisdiction from RIDEM. Mr. Thalmann explained that RIDEM takes jurisdiction based on certain criteria and perimeter wetlands and on how wetlands are classified. The wetlands behind this property are classified as a forested wetland less than three acres. So RIDEM's jurisdiction stops at the biologic edge - there is no perimeter wetland associated with it. So the design plans are submitted and reviewed, and RIDEM determines that it is nothing they take jurisdiction over; therefore, it is neither an insignificant alteration nor an application to alter. They have reviewed it and determined that there are no criteria to trigger an insignificant alteration. The applicant is held to the site plan that has been submitted.

Mr. Hunt commented that he built his entire career building on ledge.

Ledge can be worked with. He is familiar with the property.

Mr. Thalmann stated that the stopping sight distance on this road is 115' and they have at least 150' from the driveway to the property line and the curving linear portion extends beyond that. He is confident that the stopping sight distances have been met. This has also been reviewed by RIDOT for a PAP. Mr. Olean stated that the RIDOT would not have reviewed Sherman Ave. His concern is that driveway on Sherman Ave., looking to the right. He asked what the distance is from Pole #2 to Pole #4 and how far the driveway is from Pole #3. Mr. Thalmann replied 165' – 115' is required. The applicant may be amenable to a "Driveway Ahead" on Sherman Avenue as a traffic-calming device. Mr. Olean stated that in similar situations, clearing of trees may be needed, but this situation is different due to the ledge. Mr. Olean stated that he would feel better showing the curvature of the road on the plans. Ms. Wiegand stated that in the past, a letter stating the sight distance has been requested - showing posted design speed, sight distance.

Mr. Olean made a motion to defer to next month's meeting. Mr. Bostic seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Thalmann asked if a supplemental plan could be submitted rather than redrawing the whole subdivision and Mr. Olean replied yes.

MAJOR LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

a. Drive-Thru Establishment AP 41 Lot 69 Preliminary Plan Land Development

Jason M. Ruotolo Geo. Washington Hwy. Discussion/Approval

Mr. Ranaldi stated that a public hearing was held last month. The applicant has requested to come back before the Board in three months. The applicant is looking to secure a tenant for the property and to come in with a more defined design.

Mr. Reilly would feel more comfortable knowing who the tenant will be and had questions about where the window would be. Once the tenant is known, more information will be available to clarify concerns. Mr. Mercurio agreed.

Mr. Thalmann stated that they are well into the formal wetlands application process. How the property is marketed is dependent on how RIDEM will allow the property to be accessed from George Washington Highway. Mr. Ruotolo would like a level of comfort that this is what RIDEM is going to permit him to do such that he meets the criteria with respect to queuing if the establishment services food or if it is a bank. Mr. Mercurio asked if the driveway may have to cross the wetlands to gain access to the property and Mr. Thalmann replied yes. The width is in question. Mr. Mercurio asked if an entrance would have to be eliminated. Mr. Thalmann stated that

originally the plans were submitted showing one ingress lane and two egress lanes. RIDOT has come back and said that they would like to see one ingress lane and one egress lane; it changes the wetlands application a little bit. RIDOT stated that the amount of traffic generated does not rise to the level that triggers the dual egress lane.

Mr. Olean made a motion to continue this matter to the April 25, 2007 meeting. Mr. Mercurio seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**b. 90 Industrial Circle AP 2 Lot 82 Master Plan Land Development
A.F. Homes Walker Street & Industrial Circle Discussion/Approval**

Mr. Ranaldi stated that this is a development of a manufacturing lot into a residential complex. The applicant has received Zoning Board approval for 48 residential condominium units with five percent (5%) designated as affordable. This project is in front of the Board as a Master Plan Land Development Review and received a Certificate of Completeness on

January 16, 2007 and the Board has until May 15, 2007 to approve, approve with conditions or deny. With a commercial property where the engineering is so advanced, they would come in at Preliminary Plan. This is a redevelopment of an existing property so there is a lot more fine-tuning that has to go on with the engineering. It is engineering new utilities into old utilities. Everyone is taking a close hard look at this to preserve the area. The site plan shows parking

and access from Industrial Circle. A traffic island will be removed to increase access to area; interior striping will be done for the parking facilities. There is no drainage on site; only water quality improvements are needed - dry wells to absorb runoff from the cars - gasoline and oils. Several concerns with water and sewer need to be worked out through engineering means. Sewer pipes were thought to be clay, but were found to be PVC pipes. There is an Environmental Land Use Restriction (ELUR) on the property that must be shown on the plans. A traffic study has shown little impact to the area. The TRC recommends that the applicant address the concerns of the TRC and come back in February. One building is actually connected by a covered loading dock to another building; there was no indication as to what was going to happen to that area - that needs to be outlined on the plans. The applicant is here to make a presentation.

Attorney John Mancini represented the applicant. They have reviewed the TRC's report and have no opposition to the comments. They are working with the TRC and have already begun to address the TRC's concerns. Mr. Ron Lemieux from Cataldo Associates can address the drainage. Ron Cataldo, who did the traffic impact study, is also present. The Zoning Board approved a use variance in October 2006. A presentation was done with respect to traffic, the Comprehensive Plan, and how the applicant intended on rehabilitating this existing mill and reconfiguring it to residential use. The Zoning Board granted approval for 48 units, with 5% affordable units. The ELUR will be shown on the plans - they do not think there

will be an impact on project. The developer has spoken to the Town regarding sewer and is waiting for a letter. They do not perceive a problem getting water approval; there may be too much water in the area.

Chairman Mancini asked if the Zoning Board placed any others restrictions on the project other than the affordable units. Mr. Mancini stated that the only restriction was 5% affordable units. Parking and density requirements were met.

Mr. Lemieux stated that they are preparing the civil plans for the project. There is not much to add that the Town Planner and Mr. Mancini haven't covered. There is adequate parking, test pits were completed and no groundwater was present. An Underground Injection Control system will be installed. There will be a slight reduction in runoff from the site. According to the Water Department, there is high water pressure in the street and there are a number of water lines that enter the building - some lines need to be capped off. Chairman Mancini asked how much experience he has with UIC systems and Mr. Lemieux replied that he has a lot of experience with UIC systems and that the soil on this site is all sand and gravel with no ground water to be worried about. There are very specific guidelines through RIDEM and he has worked with the director of RIDEM and has several systems in place.

Mr. Reilly asked where the entrance to the building would be. He

would like to see the entrance as it relates to the parking and the curb cuts. He would not like to see the entrance right at the curb cut. He also asked about the traffic - the project does increase the amount of traffic to the area. The levels of service will change - basically there is no traffic there now from this building. There will be an increase in the amount of vehicles entering and exiting the facility. Mr. Ranaldi stated that RIDOT is installing a traffic signal at Smithfield Avenue and Walker Street. Mr. Reilly asked if traffic would be backed up due to the traffic light. Mr. Mancini stated that a traffic study was done and the 48 condo units would generate 30 trips in the am peak and 40 trips in the pm peak. There is traffic there now generated by employees and industrial traffic; this will be a different type of traffic. Mr. Ron Cataldo, a Professional Civil Engineer in RI, stated that the project would generate approximately 29 trips in the morning and 37 trips in the pm peak - a trip is a vehicle entering or exiting the site - which is approximately one vehicle every 1 ½ - 2 minutes. It is not a large traffic generator for this type of use. A traffic signal will be installed at the intersection of Walker St. and Smithfield Avenue by the end of 2007. There is an existing congestion at the site now and a warrant analysis has determined that a signal is needed - that will give a level of service of C or better. Mr. Olean asked if the traffic from the school was taken into consideration. Mr. Cataldo replied yes. Chairman Mancini asked what the age of the occupants would be. Mr. Mancini stated that there will be a mixture of one and two-bedroom units marketed to young professionals or empty nesters. Mr. Olean asked if Industrial Circle was a town road and if

the developer was paying the costs of improvements to the road. Mr. Cataldo stated yes. Mr. Olean asked if the island were removed, would the developer be installing sidewalks on Industrial Circle. Mr. Cataldo stated that the existing island would be removed, new striping would be done to the intersection, and sidewalks would be installed on one side. Mr. Olean asked if the sidewalks would be done according to RIDOT standards and Mr. Cataldo replied yes. Mr. Reilly asked if the sidewalks were shown on the plan. Mr. Cataldo stated that the sidewalks were shown on Industrial Circle. Mr. Mercurio asked about the out buildings located on the property. Mr. Lemieux stated that the out buildings would be disconnected. Mr. Mancini stated that the loading docks and canopies will be taken out - there is no use for them. Mr. Hunt asked how many parking spaces were there. Mr. Lemieux stated that there are 102 provided - 96 are required. Mr. Mercurio asked about the clay sewers - are they functional or are they fragile? Ms. Wiegand stated that the main sewer is down Industrial Drive and shown on plans as being a two-foot vitrified clay - approximately 150 years old - but was replaced with PVC about eight years ago. They will not be tapping into the clay pipes. There are other clay sewers along Walker Street and the other side of Industrial Drive that are very fragile. Chairman Mancini asked if Dig Safe could find the sewer lines and Ms. Wiegand replied no. Ms. Wiegand stated that the easements and the right of ways need to be clarified. Mr. Mancini stated that a full title search will be conducted to discern the easements and any easements crossing the property will be done by express easement and done by

a metes and bound description.

Mr. Olean made a motion to accept the recommendations of the TRC and move forward to the February meeting. Mr. Hunt seconded motion. Mr. Olean asked if that gives the applicant enough time and Mr. Mancini stated that they can accommodate the Board and is prepared to ask for a combined Preliminary and Master plan. Mr. Mercurio stated that he felt that by the presentation, most of the concerns have been addressed. Chairman Mancini stated that the Board might want to look at it one more time and consider combining Master and Preliminary Plan. Motion passed unanimously.

MAJOR SUBDIVISION REVIEW

a. Lincoln Meadows II AP 45 Lots 2, 181 & 353 Preliminary Plan Extension

Angellin, LLC Angell Road

Mr. Ranaldi stated that this is a subdivision of 3 lots into 21 conventional single-family lots. The project received Preliminary Plan approval on February 22, 2006; therefore, the applicant has until February 22, 2007 to complete the project and obtain final plan approval. The applicant has been working on Lincoln Meadows I, which is a related project. Due to weather conditions, they were unable to begin the public improvements for Lincoln Meadows II.

They are requesting a one-year extension to complete the project and the TRC recommends approval of this request. Mr. Olean asked what the time limit was on Phase I. Mr. Ranaldi stated that the applicant recently submitted an extension for Phase I - approximately 95% is done on Phase I. Mr. Olean stated that Phase II is contingent on Phase I. Is a one-year extension enough time? Mr. Ranaldi stated somewhat - Phase I is 95% completed - road is in, sewers are in. Phase II has not been worked on - they worked on the detention basin, but not the roads and sewers. Ms. Wiegand stated that they have to cross a wetland for Phase II, so they are restricted as to the time of year they can do the construction.

Mr. Puleo stated that he would like to get another year if possible. Chairman Mancini stated that he would rather give a one-year extension and have Mr. Puleo come back if he needs another extension.

Mr. Mercurio made a motion to accept the recommendation of the TRC and grant an extension of one year. Mr. Bostic seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Krieger pointed out that the regulations talk about a one-year extension possible upon written request of the applicant who must appear for annual review. Vesting can be extended for a longer period if good cause shown, if requested by the applicant prior to the expiration of the approval date in writing and approved by the

Planning Board. He advised the Board that they are restricted to a one-year extension. Chairman Mancini stated that his interpretation is different - the Board has given upward of three years. Mr. Krieger stated that it is done on an annual basis - one year at a time. Chairman Mancini agreed.

b. Rivers Subdivision AP 23 Lots 30 & 119 Preliminary Plan Discussion/

Estate of Anna M. Rivers Old River & Lower River Rd. Discussion/Approval

Mr. Ranaldi stated that this subdivision is of one lot into five single-family residential lots. It is a major subdivision at Preliminary Plan review. They received a Certificate of Completeness on December 11, 2006; the Board has until April 10, 2007 to approve, approve with conditions, or deny. They have submitted all necessary plans and reports for Preliminary Plan. The TRC reviewed the project. Last month, there was some confusion as to whether this was going to be a phased project - this will not be a phased project. The applicant was unsuccessful in resolving existing drainage issues on Lower River Road. All of their drainage will be contained on their property. The houses are designed with the storm water runoff and the drainage swales and each homeowner should be required to follow the layout that the house is designed for right now. What is shown, the grading and swales, is designed on that footprint of the house and where it is shown on the lot. The drainage would not work

if houses were put in a different location on lot. If the applicant is confident in the areas where the houses are located, then those are the requirements in the building permit stage. A wetlands permit was received. Any concerns can be addressed and come before the Board next month for a public hearing.

Mr. Olean asked if the Town has the right to tell someone where to build their house. Ms. Wiegand stated that all building permits go through the Zoning Official, the building inspector and the engineer. She compares the building permit against the subdivision approvals. Mr. Reilly asked what happens if someone wants an addition later on - what affect that addition will have on the drainage. Ms. Wiegand stated that there will be a plot plan showing everything that is proposed to be built. For example, she witnessed the location of the dry wells on Old River Road and the dry wells were noted on the plans. Mr. Mercurio stated that seems to work in theory but the Zoning application before the Board tonight where a cabana was built without a building permit. Ms. Wiegand stated no building permit was pulled for the cabana - the cabana was caught when the Town went out for a Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Mercurio asked if it could be done with a deed restriction. Mr. Reilly was concerned about the drainage issues and the location of the houses, and if someone puts on an addition and causes problems where there were no problems. Chairman Mancini asked to what extent you put a restriction. A small addition could have no impact. The best way to look at it is at the building permit stage. Mr. Bostic stated that the applicant would have

to deal with the water issue at that time. Mr. Reilly stated that if it meets the zoning setbacks, they could apply for a building permit. Mr. Thalmann stated that the site plan would be reviewed at the time a building permit is applied for. Mr. Ranaldi stated that all building permits require a certified survey.

Mr. Thalmann stated that the confusion over phasing resulted from trying to address concerns of abutting neighbors. The applicant was unsuccessful in gaining an easement. The neighbor wanted curbing, and it is his professional opinion that curbing would exacerbate the problem in the area. A wetlands permit was obtained and RIDEM was comfortable that there were no increases in runoff. Further efforts will be fruitless. All other issues have been addressed with Ms. Wiegand. The TRC comments indicate they are comfortable with a public hearing next month.

Mr. Olean made a motion to move to public hearing next month. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**c. Hien Subdivision AP 8 Lot 23 Master Plan Discussion/
Patti Hien Grandview Avenue Approval**

Mr. Ranaldi stated that this is a subdivision of one lot into two single-family residential lots. The proposed lot would need a dimensional variance for lot width; therefore, it has been elevated to Major Subdivision Review. If the proposed lot met all of the zoning, it

would have been a minor subdivision. The applicant received a Certificate of Completeness on January 16, 2007 and the Board has until May 15, 2007 to approve, approve with conditions, or deny. The TRC reviewed the application. The lot has two frontage lots - this would separate the through lot. The proposed lot is in an RS-12 zone, 12,000 sq. ft. They do have the square footage. The plans need a land surveyor to review and stamp the plans. A sedimentation and erosion control plan is required. Water is available in the street. Drainage would be minimal because it is only one new house. Originally, in the 1950's, this area was subdivided into 15 lots but was developed as 6 lots. Someone may have bought four or five lots and made them into one area. This applicant is basically just asking to redo the subdivision. The TRC recommends going to a public hearing in February. Chairman Mancini asked how many feet the applicant was looking for and Mr. Ranaldi replied seven feet (7'). Mr. Krieger stated that he reviewed the application with Mr. Ranaldi and Ms. Wiegand and spoke to Mr. Rampone, the engineer for the applicant. The Zoning Board will want to see on the final survey the distances from the various structures on the property to the edge of the property. While they are seeking a variance for the lot width, they will need deviations for encroachments for the indoor pool, garage, and various out buildings. None of those distances are shown on the plan. Mr. Ranaldi stated that the application has the correct distances requested for relief but they are not shown on the plan. Mr. Krieger did indicate the distances in his narrative but the Zoning Board has been continuing applications that did not have sufficient information.

He has spoken to Mr. Rampone and he is aware of the necessity for providing this information to the Zoning Board. Chairman Mancini stated that sometimes speed is of the essence, but he would rather see if the Zoning Board approves the variance before having a public hearing. Mr. Ranaldi stated that there is enough time - if the variance is approved on February 6th, the Board can move forward with the public hearing in February. If the Zoning Board does not approve or has questions, the public hearing can be moved back one month. Chairman Mancini asked if Mr. Rampone was looking to combine Master Plan and Preliminary Plan. Mr. Ranaldi stated that he did not make it clear. Chairman Mancini stated that he does not have a problem combining the two stages, as it would be a minor subdivision if not for the variance. He wants to make certain that the Board has everything before the public hearing. Mr. Olean agrees with Chairman Mancini that it is better to wait for the Zoning Board decision before having a public hearing.

Mr. Mercurio made a motion to advance to public hearing for combined Master Plan/Preliminary Plan pending a successful outcome of the February 6th Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Hunt seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rampone thanked the Board for their consideration.

Chairman Mancini mentioned an article that he read about an appeal of the Tiverton Planning Board because there was no written decision

from the Planning Board. He asked Mr. Ranaldi if the Board is required to have a written decision on any approvals or denials. Mr. Ranaldi replied that he asked the attorney while working on the Subdivision Regulations revision, and she said a written decision was not necessary. Mr. Ranaldi submits an Action Taken within a day or two of the Planning Board meeting. The Action Taken is posted for a month. Chairman Mancini asked Mr. Ranaldi to research the regulations and see if a written decision is necessary. Ms. Wiegand stated that during all of her years of working on the other side, she has never received a written decision. Chairman Mancini just wants to make certain that the Board is doing what they are required to do.

There being no further business to discuss, on a motion made by Mr. Hunt and seconded by Mr. Bostic, it was unanimously voted to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Weigner

Attached January TRC Report:

On January 16, 2007 at 2:30 pm, the Technical Review Committee met

to review the agenda items for the January 24, 2007 meeting of the Planning Board. In attendance were Al Ranaldi, Kim Wiegand, Michael Reilly, Russ Hervieux, and Peggy Weigner. Below are the Committee's recommendations:

Major Land Development Review

a. Drive-Thru Establishment AP 41 Lot 69 Preliminary Plan Land Development

- Jason M. Ruotolo George Washington Hwy Discussion / Approval

This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the commercial development of a single lot containing approximately 1.242 acres. The review stages were combined during the October Planning Board meeting. Therefore, this project is in front of the Planning Board for a Preliminary Plan Land Development Review. On October 16, 2006, the project submittal for the above noted project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the master plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the Preliminary Plan review must be made by February 13, 2007 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant. On Thursday, January 18, the engineer for the applicant indicated that they will be asking for a continuance of the

review process in order to receive comments and final approval from RIDEM. They would like to present to the Planning Board site design plans that reflect the RIDEM comments.

**b. 90 Industrial Circle AP 2 Lot 82 Master Plan Land Development
- A. F. Homes Walker Street & Industrial Circle Discussion /
Approval**

This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the residential development of a single lot containing approximately 1.9045 acres. The property is located in a MG-0.5 (Manufacturing General) zoning district and received a use variance for 48 residential condominium units with 5% designated as affordable. This project is in front of the Planning Board for a Master Plan Land Development Review. On January 16, 2007, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the master plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the Master Plan review must be made by May 15, 2007 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above proposed development according to the Land

Development and Subdivision Regulations standards and requirements and standard engineering. The submission includes two sheets labeled “Existing Conditions Plan” and “Concept Layout & Utility Plan”, AP 2 Lot 82, Walker Street and Industrial Circle, Lincoln, Rhode Island, prepared for the applicant A.F. Homes by Cataldo Associates Inc., dated November 22, 2006. Included in the submission is a Traffic Impact Study for the Proposed Condominium Development prepared by the above consultants for applicant, dated June 16, 2006. The following are concerns were noted by the Technical Review Committee for the proposed development.

Site Plan

The site plan shows onsite parking and access to the site from Industrial Circle. In order to provide egress, the developer proposes to eliminate a narrow traffic island opposite the access way. The developer also proposes to stripe and mark the stop bar on Industrial Circle. It is recommended that the other narrow traffic island be removed as well and the area repaved before re-striping. The site plan shows a number of outbuildings, such as loading docks and covered passage ways, attached to the existing structure. No indication of any proposed use or redevelopment of these buildings is noted on the plans. The TRC recommends that these areas be explored and the future use or redevelopment of these areas be discussed. The submitted application does not address fire access around the building. A letter from the Saylesville Fire District must be submitted.

Utilities

The applicant has contacted the Lincoln Water Commission (LWC) regarding public water for the development. The Lincoln Water Commission (LWC) must approve the water service. Preliminary Plan approval will be contingent on receipt of a letter from the LWC stating that there is sufficient public water for the project and that the plans are acceptable. The Saylesville Fire District must approve the development's water supply service for fire suppression and the location of any fire hydrants.

The existing location and discharge points for the building's sanitary sewerage may not be properly connected to the sewers, according to current standards and regulations. However, the development proposes to connect with a new lateral to the existing sewer in Industrial Circle, ensuring that new flows will be properly treated. The project will also be required to obtain approval from the Narragansett Bay Commission for the sanitary sewer discharge.

The property has several utilities on and across it, including but not limited to water, sewers and drains. These utilities are subject to easements in the Land Evidence Records. The TRC recommends that the developer work with the Town and the LWC (and others, as necessary) to clarify the location, current use, ownership and responsibility for the utilities in the easements. The developer has also been advised that there are old, (greater 100 years) vitrified clay sewers in and cross the area that are to be avoided, as they are fragile and likely to break/fracture easily.

Drainage

The site drains generally east towards Industrial Circle. It is proposed to direct runoff from the parking area into an onsite infiltration system with overflow to the existing storm drainage system which discharges dually to Bleachery Pond and the Moshassuck River. The developer will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the storm drainage system which includes the onsite catch basins and the infiltration system. The development will require an Underground Injection Control permit from RIDEM. The UIC system and catch basins will improve the water quality of the storm water runoff.

While the development will not contribute additional impervious area generating runoff from the site, the direct connection of storm water via new catch basins to existing infrastructure is problematic. The drainage must be designed so as not to cause or exacerbate flooding on the roads or to down gradient storm drains for at least a 10-year frequency storm event. It is recommended that the curb inlet and manhole on the eastern side of Industrial Circle which appears to drain into the pond, be rehabilitated with a grated inlet and deep sump catch basin.

Environmental

The site was a former industrial building. The site must be in conformance with the RIDEM's Direct Exposure Criteria for residential use. According to the developer, there is an area for an

Environmental Land Use Restriction (ELUR) on the property. The developer indicated that this area is to be kept capped and contained.

The ELUR must be shown on the plans. At the present time, no restriction has been recorded on the lot. The Engineering Office recommends that the developer review with the Planning Board any environmental site assessment studies in order to safeguard the future residents and the neighborhood during construction.

Traffic

The Traffic Impact Study findings indicated that the project will not significantly impact the safety or levels of service on the surrounding roadways. The study analyzed the existing and future development conditions at several intersections. An important element of this analysis is the RIDOT's proposed Smithfield Avenue improvements which are scheduled to begin construction in March 2007. The improvements include a traffic signal at the intersection of Walker Street, Woodland Avenue and Smithfield Avenue. The analysis states that there is adequate sight distance at the location of the proposed entrance to the site, as well as at the intersection of Industrial Circle and Walker Street. The TRC recommends that granite curbing be installed along Industrial Circle to define the location and width of the existing street.

Based on the above noted concerns, the TRC recommends that the applicant address the above noted concerns and return to the Planning Board for further review in February.

Major Subdivision Review

a. Lincoln Meadows II AP 45 Lots 2, 181, & 353 Preliminary Plan Extension

- Angellin, LLC Angell Road

This project represents the subdivision of three lots into twenty-one conventional single-family lots. The project received Preliminary Plan approval on February 22, 2006. Therefore, the applicant has until February 22, 2007 to complete the project and obtain final plan approval. The applicant has been working on Lincoln Meadows I, which is related to this project. Due to weather conditions, the applicant was unable to begin the public improvements for Lincoln Meadows II. The applicant is requesting a one year extension to complete the project. The TRC has reviewed the application and recommends approval of this request.

b. Rivers Subdivision AP 23 Lots 30 and 119 Preliminary Plan Discussion /

- Estate of Anna M. Rivers Old River & Lower River Road Approval

This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the subdivision of one lot into five single-family residential lots. The project is proposed to be reviewed in one phase. On

December 11, 2006, the Preliminary Plan submittal for the above noted project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the preliminary plan as submitted, approve with changes and /or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the Preliminary Plan must be made by April 10, 2007 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant. Below are the TRC recommendations for this project.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above proposed development according to the Land Development and Subdivision Regulations standards and requirements and standard engineering. The plans reviewed were entitled “Preliminary Plan Submission”, Lincoln, RI, Major Subdivision, AP 23 Lots 30 & 119, Old River Road & Lower River Road, prepared for Estate of Anna Rivers c/o Brian Balsofiore, Executor by Thalmann Engineering Co., Inc. revision dated 12/11/06. An additional detail of the swale proposed for lot 4 was received 1/12/07. The following were previously received and reviewed:

- 1. A report entitled “Master Plan – Development Impact Narrative” dated March 2005 prepared by the above for the above applicant.**
- 2. A report entitled “Sight Distance Analysis” was prepared for the proposed subdivision by RAB Professional Engineers, Inc. dated May 25, 2005.**
- 3. A report entitled “Drainage Report & Calculations” dated 7/3/06 for**

the above applicant by the above engineers.

Site Plan

Test pits to evaluate the soil conditions were performed onsite and witnessed by the Town Engineer. Three of the houses are shown as slab on grade due to the depth to seasonal high groundwater and/or ledge. Since the area is subject to seasonal high groundwater the following should be a condition for subdivision approval: “No finished floors or basements shall be constructed at or below the seasonal high groundwater, as located by a certified soil evaluator”. This certification must be included for review at the time that the building permit application is filed. The site has a significant amount of ledge visible. Any blasting or drilling could have an adverse impact on existing structures. It is recommended that the developer perform pre-blast surveys prior to any blasting, if it is needed.

Utilities

A note on the plan states that the applicant proposes public water and sewers connections via existing lines in Old River Road and Lower River Road. In a letter dated June 30, 2005, the LWC has stated that water service was available to the development. The LWC water superintendent, John Faile stated in a telephone conversation on November 20, 2006, that the conditions in that letter have been satisfactorily met. Final approval from LWC must be a condition of approval for subdivision. The applicant must apply to the sewer supervisor for availability of public sanitary sewers to the project.

The developer must apply to Narragansett Bay Commission (NBC) for indirect discharge permits. The NBC's approval must be a condition of approval for subdivision.

Traffic

The developer has obtained a Physical Alteration Permit from RI Department of Transportation for the proposed project which includes the driveways and replacement of the existing sidewalk. According to the Sight Distance Analysis report, driveways can be located so as to have adequate stopping sight distances in accordance with the appropriate criteria. The area required to be cleared along the frontage of Old River Road has been shown on the preliminary plans.

Drainage

The site drains generally from Old River Road south and easterly towards Lower River Road. There is no drainage system, open or closed, to collect runoff along this section of Lower River Road. Several properties on Lower River Road have concerns with storm water runoff. Lower River has an existing problem with drainage flowing from the west side over the road to the lower properties. The engineer has designed all of the lots with associated grading and proposed house location so as to mitigate any impact from the development by incorporating infiltration systems and drainage swales. The plans include additional details for construction of the swales. The drainage swale parallel to Lower River Road has been

moved to be more on the property. Details for the proposed retaining wall have been shown on the plans. These layouts are integral to the drainage success of the project. The specific lot layouts will have to be noted as a condition of approval. Individual home owners will be required to build the house in the layout as shown. As a condition of approval, a note must be placed on the plans stating that future home owners must locate the future house in the spot indicated and install the associated grading and infiltration system as presented on the approved plans.

Wetlands

The subdivision has received approval from RIDEM Wetlands (#06-0329).

The TRC recommends that the applicant address the above noted concerns and proceed to the public hearing stage of the process in February. An updated abutters list will be needed by the Planning Department for notification purposes.

c. Hien Subdivision AP 8 Lot 23 Master Plan Discussion

- Patti Hien Grandview Avenue Approval

This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the subdivision of one residential lot into two single-family residential lots. All lots are accessed from existing roadways. The subject lot is located in zoning district RS-12 (12,000 square feet –

Residential Single Family). This application is classified as a Major Subdivision due to its need for a dimensional variance for lot width of the proposed lot. On January 16, 2007, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the master plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the Master Plan review must be made by May 15, 2007 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above proposed development according to the Land Development and Subdivision Regulations standards and requirements and standard engineering. The plan reviewed was entitled "Major Subdivision" 65 Grandview Ave. Major Subdivision, Lincoln, RI, AP 8 Lot 23, Lakeview and Grandview Avenues, prepared for Patti A. Hien by Paul S. Rampone, P.E. dated December 20, 2006. Other documents submitted as listed in a letter dated December 20, 2006 from Mr. Rampone to the Town Planner. Due to the fact that the applicant has met the submission requirements for Preliminary Plan review, the TRC recommends that this application be elevated to the Preliminary Plan review stage. Below are the TRC recommendations for this project.

Site Plan

The site plan shows two frontage lots from one. The information presented on the site plan indicates that there is adequate buildable area for each lot. A final plan must be prepared by a registered land surveyor. The current plan is based on an existing survey plan stamped by a registered engineer and therefore the dimensions appear to be accurately depicted. The plan notes that there does not appear to be any wetlands on or adjacent to the site. The developer must submit a sedimentation and erosion control plan to Engineering for approval at the time a building permit is requested for the new lot if the zoning relief is granted.

Utilities

A plan shows that the applicant proposes public water and sewers connections via existing lines in Lakeview Avenue. The Lincoln Water Commission (LWC) has stated in writing that water service is available. The LWC's approval must be a condition of any approval for subdivision. The sewer supervisor has given notice that public sanitary sewers are available to the project. There is an existing sewer service stub to the property where it fronts on Lakeview Avenue. The developer must obtain approval for the Narragansett Bay Commission for the additional indirect discharge.

Drainage

The proposed lots drain to the road. The drainage system on Lakeview Avenue is minimal. In order to prevent any adverse impact, a condition of approval should also include the specification that no

finished floors or basements shall be constructed at or below the seasonal high groundwater elevation. This condition must be met at the time that the building permit is to be obtained.

Pending a successful outcome of the February 6, 2007 Zoning Board meeting, the TRC recommends that the applicant address the above noted concerns and proceed to the public hearing stage of the process in February. An updated abutters list will be needed by the Planning Department for notification purposes.

Minor Subdivision Review

a. Roberts Minor Subdivision AP 23 Lot 68 Preliminary Plan Review /

- Robert Family Trust Great Road & Sherman Ave Approval

This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the subdivision of one lot into three residential lots. All lots are accessed from an existing road. The proposed project is classified as a Minor Subdivision. On January 16, 2007, the Preliminary Plan submittal for the above noted project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations – Section 14(G), “if no street creation or extension is required, the Planning Board shall approve, deny, or approve with conditions, the preliminary plan within sixty five (65) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as is agreed to by the applicant and the Board, according to the requirements of

Section 8 herein. Therefore, a decision on the Preliminary Plan review must be made by March 21, 2007 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above proposed subdivision according to the Land Development and Subdivision Regulations preliminary plan submission standards and requirements and standard engineering practices. The set reviewed (sheets 1-3) was entitled “Roberts Minor Subdivision”, Lincoln, RI, AP 23 Lot 68, Sherman Avenue & Great Road, prepared for Roberts Family Trust by Thalmann Engineering Co., Inc. revision date December 2006. The submission included site evaluation forms describing the soils found in test pits relative to proposed dry wells. A letter from Lincoln Water Commission (LWC) was received as well as a letter from Natural Resources Services regarding the wetlands on site. The development has received a physical alteration permit from RIDOT. A prior application (04-0068) reviewed by RIDEM Wetlands determined that no alteration to the wetlands was proposed. Below are the TRC recommendations for this project.

Site Plan

The site plan shows three frontage lots from one. The information presented on the site plan indicates that there is adequate buildable area for each lot. The lot #1 has a considerable amount of ledge. Blasting or drilling is a concern as there could be an impact on adjacent structures and the existing hydrology. It is recommended

that a condition of subdivision approval that for any blasting for construction on this site, the blaster must conduct a pre-blast survey of adjacent properties.

Utilities

A plan shows that the applicant proposes public water and sewers connections via existing lines in Sherman Avenue and Great Road. The LWC has stated in a letter dated May 30, 2006 that public water service is available to the development. The LWC's final approval must be a condition of for subdivision approval. The applicant must apply to the sewer supervisor for availability of public sanitary sewers to the project. There is one existing connection to the lot, now labeled lot #2. The existing house is proposed to reconnect to public sewers on Great Road. Due to the large outcropping of ledge between the house and the road, the proposed location may not be ideal. The developer must apply to Narragansett Bay Commission for indirect discharge permits.

Traffic

The applicant has obtained a Physical Alteration Permit (#060605) from RI Department of Transportation for re-grading within the ROW and one proposed driveway onto Great Road.

Drainage

The proposed lots drain to the road. There is no drainage infrastructure in the roads. Drainage currently flows to a low point on

the corner within the right of way where it collects. In order to prevent any adverse impact, the lots with proposed new houses have proposed onsite dry wells to capture the roof runoff. A condition of any approval should also include the specification that no finished floors or basements shall be constructed at or below the seasonal high groundwater elevation, as determined by a certified soil evaluator. A note referring to this condition has been included on the plans.

Wetlands

The subdivision received a letter of Non-Jurisdiction from RIDEM Wetlands dated May 10, 2004. The plan as proposed does not appear to have an impact on the wetlands.

The TRC has determined that the concerns noted above can easily be resolved by the applicant. Therefore, the TRC recommends that this minor subdivision be Approved with Conditions. The conditions are as follows:

1. A sedimentation and erosion control plan must be submitted for review and approval at the time a building permit for each additional house.
2. If any blasting for construction on this site is required, the blaster must conduct a pre-blast survey of adjacent properties.
3. The developer must obtain approval for the Narragansett Bay Commission for the additional indirect discharge.
4. Final Water Plan approval must be granted from the Lincoln Water

Commission.

- 5. A note must be added to the final recorded plans stating that no finished floors or basements shall be constructed at or below the seasonal high groundwater elevation.**
- 6. A note must be added to the final recorded plans stating that the zoning setbacks shown on the recorded plans are for reference only. Actual setbacks to be determined at the time of construction/development of the land.**
- 7. The applicant must apply to the sewer supervisor for availability of public sanitary sewers to the project.**
- 8. A note must be added to the final recorded plans stating that the proposed new houses must have dry wells installed to capture the roof runoff.**
- 9. Granite bounds must be installed and shown on the final recorded plans marking the location of all property corners.**

Zoning Applications (*) – February Zoning Applications

**JMC, LLC, 3437 Mendon Road, Cumberland, RI – Application for appeal of Planning Board denial of the Master Plan for JCM Estates located on Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI
AP 26, Lot 2 Zoned: RA 40**

This is an appeal of the Planning Board's September 28, 2006 decision denying the Master Plan for JCM Estates located on Jenckes Hill Road. A complete record of this application has been forwarded

to the Planning Board of Appeals for their review and consideration.

Anthony Marchetti, 10 Morning Star Court, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Relief seeking rear yard relief for the construction of an addition.

AP 26, Lot 238 Zoned: RA 40

This application was continued by the Zoning Board in order for the applicant to supply the Board with additional information. According to the Zoning Official, no new information or plans were submitted. Therefore, the TRC could not render a new recommendation. The existing recommendation is as follows: Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The TRC recommends Denial of the application for a dimensional variance. The Committee feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a dimensional variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the TRC feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The TRC feels that the applicant has sufficient room to the side of the property to locate an addition without having to request a variance. The Technical Review Committee feels that the dimensional variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Town of Lincoln, 100 Old River Road, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional

Variance seeking light pole height relief for school and athletic fields located at 152 Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI.

AP 26, Lots 38/39/41/43 Zoned: RA 40

This application was continued by the Zoning Board in order for the applicant to consult with the neighbors. New information or plans were not submitted to the Technical Review Committee. Therefore, the TRC could not render a recommendation.

Wojciech Marczak, 43 Mark Drive, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for rear yard setback for the construction of an addition.

AP 19, Lot 87 Zoned: RS 20

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The TRC recommends Denial of the application for a dimensional variance. The Committee feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a dimensional variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the TRC feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The TRC feels that the applicant has sufficient room to the side of the property to locate an addition without having to request a variance. The Technical Review Committee feels that the dimensional variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Rita M. Caraccia, 393 Great Road, Lincoln, RI – Use Variance for two additional apartments for a total of six units on property located at 1431 Smithfield Avenue, Lincoln, RI.

AP 9, Lot 130 Zoned: RL 9

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Technical Review Committee recommends Denial of this use variance. The TRC feels that the use variance for two additional apartments for a total of six units on property located at 1431 Smithfield Avenue is inconsistent with the surrounding area and inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Committee feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a use variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the TRC feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The Technical Review Committee feels that the use variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Superb Builders, Inc., 6 Red Brook Crossing, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for rear yard setback for the construction of a cabana on property located at 6 Pine Tree Lane, Lincoln, RI.

AP 26, Lot 275 Zoned: RA 40

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. During the site visit, the TRC discovered that the cabana was already built. The Zoning Official noted that the building was built without a building permit and zoning relief and therefore was built illegally. The TRC recommends Denial of the application for a dimensional variance. The Committee feels that the application does not meet any of the standards for relief of a dimensional variance as presented in the Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the TRC feels that the site plan and application does not represent the least relief necessary and is not due to the unique characteristics of the subject land. The development of the existing residential house and cabana began on a vacant lot. Before building began, the applicant had opportunities to design and locate their proposed structures within the set zoning setbacks. The TRC feels that the applicant has sufficient room on the property to locate a cabana without having to request a variance. The Technical Review Committee feels that the dimensional variance will alter the general character of the surrounding area and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

Patti Hien, 65 Grandview Avenue, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for lot width relief, front and side yard setback relief for the subdivision of property located at 65 Grandview Avenue, Lincoln, RI. AP 8, Lot 23 Zoned: RS 12

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and

reviewed the submitted plans and application. The proposed dimensional variances are to clear up the pre-existing nonconformance of this parcel of land. This lot and existing buildings were platted and developed before present day zoning regulations. Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The Technical Review Committee recommends Approval of this application. The TRC finds that the relief requested will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance or the Lincoln Comprehensive Plan.

Correspondence/Miscellaneous (*)

1. Letter from Alexander Punchak of 19 Twin River Road to Greg Sculos, General Manager of Lincoln Park, and copied to the Planning Board dated January 7, 2007

2. Industrial Park / Quality Drive AP28 Lots 22 and 23 Admin. Subdivision Approved

This represents an administrative subdivision of property lines. This subdivision was recorded on December 19, 2006.

3. Ledge Road AP25 Lot 33 Final Plan Approval

This represented the subdivision of one lot into two residential lots. On December 20, 2006, the applicant successfully addressed all of the preliminary plan approval conditions. Therefore, final plan was issued and the final plan was recorded.

4. Letter for the Planning Board to the Town Council regarding the proposed Zoning Amendments. This letter was discussed by the Planning Board during their November 15, 2006 meeting.

5. Land Use 2025 Executive Summary of the Rhode Island State Land Use Policies and Plan.